

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/305,390

Applicant(s)
Yamamoto

Examiner
Richard Hutson

Group Art Unit
1652



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Richard Hutson (3) John Li

(2) Rebecca Prouty (4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 30, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed:

Matsuyama et al., Peoples et al. and Summerville et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant expressed his intention to overcome the current 112 rejection by limiting the claimed methods to using naturally occurring proteins. Applicant further communicated to the examiners why the references Peoples et al. and Matsuyama et al. did not make obvious the claimed invention. Applicant stressed that if in fact this would have been obvious that it would have been done prior to applicants disclosure. The examiners agreed that while this argument supports the applicants assertion that the claimed method was not obvious, both examiners agreed that this being the only argument presented the rejection would have to be maintained. Examiners invited applicant to expand his reasoning on the record why he believed that the current 103 rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant further argued that the structures are different.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.